

Wisconsin Library Services (WiLS) ILL Lending

728 State Street / Madison, WI 53706

EMail: wilsill@wils.wisc.edu



WIH TN: 1683421

Borrower: TXI

Lending String:

*WIH, WIH, WIH, WIH, WIH

Patron: Wright, Jonathan

Journal Title: [Issue papers]

Volume: Issue:

Month/Year: 1990 **Pages:**

Article Author:

Article Title: Social Democrats U.S.A.;
On foreign policy and defense

OCLC Number: 27158047

ILL Number: 68714078



WIH

Location: hist

Call #: 92-2788 (pam)

Request Date: 20100907

Need By:

Shipping Address:

Albert B. Alkek Library, ILL

64 SATvia TEXpress

AlkekLibrary

Interlibrary Loan

Texas State University-San Marcos 601 Un

Fax: 512-245-3002/Ariel 147.26

Ariel: 147.26.108.32



PDF:

MaxCost: 50.00IFM

Borrowing Notes:

Copyright Compliance: CCL

ARIEL

Wisconsin Library Services (WiLS)

Please report all document delivery problems within 48 hours of receipt.

**Return this sheet via fax (608-263-3684) or Ariel (144.92.126.152) or
email (wilsill@wils.wisc.edu).**

Briefly state the problem:

ILL number: _____

ON FOREIGN POLICY AND DEFENSE

A great democratic revolution is taking place in our midst.... Some think it a new thing and, supposing it an accident, hope they can still check it; others think it irresistible, because it seems to them the most continuous, ancient, and permanent tendency known to history.

Thus wrote Alexis de Tocqueville in *Democracy in America* a century and a half ago. What appeared inevitable in the mid-19th century came into doubt in the 20th, as totalitarian ideologies conquered nations and continents, as modern tyrants sought to cast the world in their tormented image.

Now as the 21st century nears, the great democratic revolution has reemerged in the world's midst, as people from the fallen Berlin Wall to Tiananmen Square, from Managua to Johannesburg assert that continuous and ancient struggle for freedom. Today is a time for celebration of freedom's triumph, for a resounding rededication to democracy's cause, and for constant remembrance of what democracy's absence has meant and still means for much of the world.

Social Democrats, USA is proud to have played its part in that defense and promotion of freedom. Thirty years ago we asserted, "It is not enough, and never was, for socialists to carry on the struggle for democracy in this country; they must champion democracy everywhere and support the democratic struggles of the people in all countries. That means in Asia as in Africa, in Europe of the East as well as of the West; it means to fight for democracy in China as in India, in Russia as in Algeria. It means to fight for the same rights of the exploited and oppressed of the Stalinist states as in any other country."

This has been the credo of Social Democrats, USA. We believed in joining others in the general defense of democracy while fighting for its expansion at home; we believed in supporting all who struggled for democracy and human rights even if their chances of success seemed

dim, for we believed that only in their struggle could democracy ever be achieved; we believed in maintaining the strength of democracy's strongest outposts for only through such defense could democracy's successes be saved; and we believed that once the struggle for expanding democracy was forsaken, then it would be lost. The ideals of social democracy for social justice, human dignity, and material well-being for working people are inextricably tied to the struggle for democracy. Those who have suffered the indignities and oppression of dictatorship know that no benefits arise from a state of political servitude.

Even as the world celebrates the great democratic revolution, however, it must not forget that democracy remains distant or still-borne for many. The greatest redoubt of dictatorship remains China where once-touted communist reformers turned to brutal repression to destroy the Democracy Movement that inspired the world. Today, the over one billion inhabitants of China are subject to a return of some of the worst practices of Mao Tse Tung. In the Soviet Union, communist power and bureaucracy still seeks to maintain itself despite 70 years of abject failure. So, too, in the remaining satellites and satraps of these two powers little Stalins and Maos hold sway. In Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, brutal dictators and Islamic fundamentalists continue to retain power; military regimes and establishments still threaten the will of the people in many countries, including those that have in the recent past held democratic elections.

Yet, the world has witnessed remarkable uprisings for democratic change, testimony to the aspiration for freedom among peoples long subjected to the torturous experiments of dictatorship. It is communism's collapse in Eastern and Central Europe that has most inspired the democratic world in the last year. Throughout 1989, one after another impossible historical moment was achieved: the Polish communists' abdication of political monopoly in the face of crushing electoral defeat; the East German people's breaching of the Berlin Wall and

their march toward free elections; Hungarian society's quiet determination to put an end to the legacy of 1956; the remarkable "velvet revolution" of the Czech and Slovak nations; the overthrow of Bulgaria's Thodor Zhivkov and the rise of a united democratic front in that country; and finally the violent overthrow of Eastern Europe's most tormented oppressor, Nicolai Ceaucescu. Today, the Baltic nations are asserting their sovereignty and Lithuania's newly elected government has declared the independence of that country of two million people.

Democracy's strength relies on the vigilance of its defenders and promoters.

The stunning rapidity of events over the last year in China, Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union has shown the utter bankruptcy of the communist experiment. So, too, the victory of Violeta Chamorro and the UNO coalition in Nicaragua has demonstrated the force of democratic aspirations against revolutionary despotism. From Chile to South Africa, we witness the power of democratic movements against oppressive governments. As we stated two years ago, "The breadth and success of democratic change has borne out the most fundamental truth of our times: that people seek the freedom to govern their own lives and to choose freely who will govern them."

For over 70 years, such fundamental truths have been overshadowed by the great and petty tyrannies of this century, and particularly by Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia. Totalitarian power set out to exterminate peoples, extirpate nations, and extinguish all freedom. The success of totalitarian power, particularly the endurance of its communist variant, offered an alluring alternative to the seeming decline of democracy. Even in democracy's outpost, the West, diplomacy often fell victim to the belief that freedom's beneficiaries were to be only a chosen few.

Democracy today has regained its strength, particularly among people who have experienced its absence, inspiring those who have taken liberty's benefits for granted. For this democratic revival, the staunch alliance of democratic nations may take credit. It was the continued

military and political strength of the United States and of the Atlantic Alliance in the face of the Soviet Union's military and political aggression that today allows us to witness freedom sweeping Eastern Europe. It was the human rights policies of the United States and other democratic nations that gave sustenance to the movements for democracy in the rest of the world. As Vaclav Havel stated in his speech to a joint session of Congress, it was the strength of that part of the world which defended freedom which "helped us to survive until today."

Ultimately, however, the heroes of the great democratic revolution in our midst are the workers and peasants, students and intellectuals, the ordinary men and women who dared to challenge tyranny, who risked their lives for liberty, who sacrificed themselves for a simple aspiration to live in freedom. To them we owe the hope that as the 21st century nears, we may finally bury the tyrannies that have plagued this century, that we may finally create the "family of man" to which Lincoln aspired and Havel now turns. We may see not only a new European era but also a new international era.

With the resounding success of democratic movements come many challenges and dangers. Eastern European nations are confronting the daunting task of overcoming the past 45 years of communist rule, yet Western nations are finding it difficult to enter the period of democratic opportunity. One may attribute the lack of vision evident in the United States and Western Europe to the after effects of the post-war world's politics, a politics distorted by the very strength of Soviet communism. The Bush Administration's scandalous policy of appeasement toward China's despotic rulers following the Tiananmen Square massacre is the most telling example of such distorted political vision. Even as *realpolitik* and *ostpolitik* have been discredited, the Bush Administration finds refuge in its safe prescriptions to maintain the status quo.

Yet, for the benefit of democracy's future --and present-- we must not simply relish victory, nor await continued success on the strength of past policies. Democracy's strength relies on the vigilance of its defenders and promoters; as we have seen twice in this century, it is when democratic nations remain passive that tyranny triumphs. The status quo will never be a safe haven. Only in the purposeful vision of democratic change can a peaceful world be built.

In Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, there is enor-

mous danger that democracy's newly found roots will be left to wither in the shadow of past oppression and national conflict. Unresolved historical tragedies and enmities threaten to destabilize the region; in particular, the reluctance of both West and East Germans to confront the past openly has left other Central and Western European nations suspicious and fearful of a reunified Germany. It is not enough simply to accept past penance: the legacy of the Warsaw Pact has prevented any adequate reckoning of the legacy of Nazi Germany. Only today may West and East Germans, Poles and Hungarians, Bulgarians and Rumanians, Czechs and Slovaks freely confront the crimes of Hitler and his allies, and it is only through such a free discourse that a united and peaceful Europe may take shape, one with secure borders and free movement.

The United States--and the NATO Alliance--will be essential to finding such historical resolution and to prevent any possibility of a reemerging despot bent on imperial design. NATO was born out of an alliance across the Atlantic among democratic nations committed to preserving themselves and others; it is out of this legacy that a broader alliance of democratic nations may be born and preserved and that the dangerous application of great power politics may be avoided. If there is the temptation to trumpet again the slogan, "America, come home," out of the belief that the job has been done, it is only necessary to remember that it is when America has withdrawn itself that democracy and the United States have been threatened.

A further danger exists that arises from the legacy of pre- and post-war isolationism: a growing belief that the sacrifices required in the post-war world have exhausted the United States, its treasury, and its ability to protect and defend its interests. Such are the implications of much of the budget debate surrounding support for emerging democracies. It is an historical paradox that just at the moment when the United States has found most successful the pursuit of its natural interests to promote and expand democracy--interests often confused in past decades by temporal alliances with petty dictators--there is a reluctance to continue such foreign policy pursuits. It is an even greater irony that just at the moment when the rest of the world is looking to the United States as a model for building democracy, when national interests no longer need be confused with imperial power, the United States once again seems unwilling to take its place as a leading member in a new democratic world.

The danger to democracy's cause, and also to the inter-

ests of the United States, of such a withdrawal of American power and purpose should not be underestimated. Democracy is not an historical imperative but rather a political ideal to which people aspire; democracy requires steadfast support and constant vigilance to succeed; democratic government requires the building of strong and stable democratic institutions that may withstand a demagogue's call to tyranny; and democracy requires a sound and free economy and free society to thrive.

The newly emerging democracies of Eastern Europe, Nicaragua, Panama, Chile, and hopefully soon South Africa, together with the newly established democracies of the Philippines, Argentina, Brazil and many other countries, need and want American political and economic leadership. Particularly in Eastern Europe, where communists leveled both civil society and a private economy to the ground, help is needed to build anew the structures of a democratic society.

To these countries, many are saying that the federal coffers of the United States are empty, that existing expenditures for America's friends who have risked so much should be cut, and that in any case too many needs in the United States have been unmet and must be tended to now that defense expenditures will be reduced.

Such a debate has been forced by the fiscal irresponsibility of the last 10 years, and the present lack of vision among America's political leadership. Yet a simple truth must be told: the United States cannot afford, either politically or economically, to absolve itself from today's clear and present responsibilities and opportunities. In the present global marketplace, a withdrawal of American political power and purpose will result in economic stagnation. More importantly, the future of American democracy will rest on the strength of the democratic alliance it may build. It will do the United States no good to alienate the very people who now look to the US for democratic leadership. Now is the time to build a strong and enduring world democratic alliance, one as enduring and as beneficial as NATO.

This is not a call for handouts or the abdication of assistance programs to international banking organizations, as some would have it, nor is it a call for the wholesale transfer of defense expenditures to foreign aid. Neither are required nor prudent. Social Democrats, USA welcomes the opportunity today to reduce the military budget, which for so long has drained the economy. This may be done, yet with the clear-headedness that has

guided post-war defense and foreign policy. Even as we see dramatic changes in the Soviet Union, it remains militarily armed as a superpower. We hope that the sweep of democracy will take hold also in the Soviet Union as it has in Eastern Europe, and as is indicated by the rise of democratic worker and political movements. But the course is as yet unclear. The United States thus must maintain its deterrent and defense forces at a level needed as reductions in both nuclear and conventional forces are established.

Even so, it is clear that military expenditures will be reduced dramatically, as they should be. Social Democrats, USA supported the general notion that the common defense of the United States and of the NATO Alliance required a strong military, even as we may have disagreed with particular defense policies. That position, we believe, was justified and vindicated. But there is no reason to support the same level of military expenditures for a threat that is diminishing. Now may be a time for more purposeful allocation of resources for domestic and international needs.

Now is also a time to redirect foreign and international assistance to more purposeful ends. American foreign aid in the past has often been wasted in misapplied notions of development assistance, which didn't assist and didn't develop for the very reason that it was often expended without any strategy for building democracy. Both governments and banks have shown how bankrupt international lending policies can be when they are given to corrupt and despotic governments whose officials are totally unaccountable to the people.

Now is the time for a fund for democracy, building on the successes of the National Endowment for Democracy and other institutions, like the AFL-CIO, which have played an important role in the great democratic revolution in the world. Now is not the time to "save Gorbachev" or to maintain stability in relations with China's despotic leaders; now is the time to "bankroll democracy." The new democracies in Eastern Europe, in Nicaragua, Panama and other countries need enormous assistance in establishing systems of democracy. The United States should play the leading role in that cause.

For the past 25 years American foreign policy has been beset by partisan disagreements, between Democrats and Republicans, between isolationists and internationalists, between militarists and pacifists. Social Democrats, USA has often found itself in the midst of rancorous

debates on the purpose and practice of American foreign policy. We believe that our positions have stood the test of the times. Yet now the principal divisions that rent foreign policy decisions in the past -- particularly U.S. policy towards the communist world and the Soviet Union -- should be put to rest. Now is the time for a democratic bipartisanship.

The Soviet Union

The progressive easing of U.S.-Soviet tensions tied to significant political changes in the USSR vindicates the long-held and oft-criticized SD, USA position that stable relations and peace could only be achieved on the basis of a fundamental restructuring of the Soviet system. While others advocated the idea that exchanges and increased cooperation would facilitate changes in Soviet foreign, domestic and human rights policies, SD, USA consistently maintained that true *detente* had to be predicated on political democratization and social liberalization within the Soviet Union.

The past year saw remarkable political changes in the Soviet Union. Last March, voters elected representatives to a newly created Congress of People's Deputies, which has evolved an informal parliamentary opposition. In the last month, a significant number of opposition candidates were elected to republican parliaments and local offices in the Baltics, the Ukraine, Byelorussia and Russia. Lithuania, as well as Latvia and Estonia, have taken concrete steps toward independence, rightly insisting that they were forcibly incorporated into the USSR as a result of the 1939 Hitler-Stalin Pact. Secessionist sentiments have also gained ground in Soviet Georgia and other republics in the Caucuses and Central Asia. An increasingly fractious and fragmented Communist Party has given up its "leading role," though the Central Committee insisted the party keep its "stabilizing role" and, by implication, a permanent share of government. Nevertheless, for all practical purposes the USSR now has a nascent multi-party system and a draft law legalizing non-communist parties is expected soon.

On the downside, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev has consolidated greater authority through a reinforced presidency that gives him (or a successor) sweeping powers, and he currently enjoys a personal dominance over the USSR not seen since the days of Joseph Stalin. Economic *perestroika* has been a dismal failure partly because of half-measure market reforms and the continued dominance of an entrenched *nomenklatura*. The

once touted cooperative movement faces stricter government regulation in the face of citizen complaints about profiteering and price gouging. Proposed agricultural reform has met stiff resistance from wary peasants and collective farm workers. The bloated and inefficient industrial sector remains under centralized control, and piecemeal structural changes have been sabotaged by self-serving bureaucrats. While the struggle for national self-determination has spawned many democratic groups worthy of the West's support, it has also contributed to the rise of some groups seeking to exploit ethnic and religious hatred, groups characterized by insularity, anti-Western and anti-democratic ideas. There is also an alarming resurgence of a more blatant anti-Semitism. On these disturbing developments, the silence of Gorbachev is deafening.

True detente had to be predicted on political democratization and social liberalization within the Soviet Union.

While SD, USA applauds greater steps toward genuine pluralism and democratization, we are concerned about Gorbachev's accumulation of personal power, the failure to develop and implement a coherent strategy for economic reform, and the use of military and economic intimidation to pressure independence-minded republics. Under the pretext of quelling inter-ethnic violence, Moscow used troops to try to quash the Popular Front in Azerbaijan. Force has also been used in Georgia and Uzbekistan. More recently, after Lithuanian declared its intention to withdraw from the Soviet Union, the central government threatened economic retaliation and troops were put on maneuvers. Forms of economic blackmail have also been used in the other Baltic republics.

SD, USA supports the principle of genuine self-determination with guarantees safeguarding the rights of all ethnic minorities. As a multinational confederation, the Soviet Union consists of several nations contained within historic territories, many of them forcibly incorporated into the USSR after the Revolution. If the democratically elected governments of these republics, in accordance with the expressed wishes of the majority of their people,

choose to become independent of the Soviet Union (a principle guaranteed in the Soviet Constitution), such efforts should be recognized and supported. The disintegration of the Soviet Union need not be destabilizing and heighten tensions if Moscow chooses negotiation over confrontation. Economic interdependence between newly free states and Moscow could mitigate against open, long-term confrontation if Gorbachev chooses to respect the democratic aspirations of the republics and discuss such complex issues as de-militarization, the removal (where applicable) of nuclear weapons and related matters. We should not compromise principles merely in the hope of preventing Moscow from acting ruthlessly and undemocratically.

The Soviet disengagement from Eastern Europe presents an opportunity for significant arms reduction, troop withdrawals and trade agreements. While SD, USA agrees that the U.S. should reconsider trade limits and extend to the USSR rights enjoyed by other non-market economies, we believe that future concessions and agreements must continue to be linked to the pace and scope of democratic changes, and we oppose initiatives like the Gephardt proposal advocating no-strings-attached economic support.

The Soviet Union is today in a precarious transition. The leadership is plagued by a collapsing economy, nationalist unrest, increased Party disunity, inter-ethnic strife, and an increasingly restive and impatient population. Gorbachev, who until recently had managed to carefully stage-manage the pace of change, is now reacting to political processes that have found their own dynamic and momentum, compelling him to further consolidate his power to shore up the collapsing authority of the government and revitalize *perestroika*, which has been dead in the water for several years. Many promised reforms in the area of civil liberties have yet to be institutionalized. Given these realities, SD, USA recognizes that democratic inroads remain tenuous, and that continued vigilance is needed. The U.S. must remain firmly committed to the democratic processes, not necessarily to the fate of Gorbachev.

Eastern Europe

After more than 50 years of devastation brought on by war and occupation visited on them by Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union, and the subsequent imposition of communist rule by the Red Army, Eastern Europeans may finally look to the future with some hope.

They now have the chance to rediscover their national identities, to resolve conflict through diplomacy, to overcome historical prejudices, and to build democracy in a Europe united and not divided. The great symbol of the post-war divide, the Berlin Wall, has been torn down by the East German people; the iron curtains grown rusty have been cut by the peoples of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Romania.

The course of democracy will not be steady; there are many different challenges to overcome. Eastern Europe is a region of devastated economies, ecological disasters, and human suffering. Yet, the people saved enough of their dignity and their aspirations for freedom. Communism was unable to retain any legitimacy or even, over time, its terror. Even in Ceausescu's Romania, fear was overcome to throw off the yoke of Europe's most twisted tyrant. It is these aspirations for freedom where hope lies in Eastern Europe.

The complete control of the state over the economy has produced devastation and poverty.

The first free elections in Eastern Europe in over 50 years are necessary for the establishment of genuine democracy. Yet, the region will remain in a period of difficult transition from communism to democracy--a unique historical experience--for some time to come. Democracy's hold will assert itself slowly over the course of time, as societies newly freed build the sound foundations for a democratic future. However, time may also work against political stability. Economic hardship, ethnic conflict, social backwardness, and political inexperience threaten the new course towards democracy, particularly in Romania, where past members of the communist leadership have tried to assert power.

The political instability of the region is found in the enormous number of new parties that have emerged in each of the Eastern European countries. Where democratic elections have not been held for so long, there has been no possibility for parties to test their strength with the electorate, and thus establish the basis for some political alignment. At the same time, members of the

ancien regime are trying to recapture some measure of power and influence, either through political parties or economic holdings.

The complete control of the state over the economy has produced devastation and poverty. Today, Eastern Europe must try to build the semblance of a normal economy, one where debate over the distribution of wealth may have some real meaning. Indeed, social democrats must admit that in Eastern Europe today the philosophy of the free market has much greater appeal than a social democratic philosophy, even among those who would have such orientation. To aspire to social democracy as it has been practiced in Western Europe requires at the least building its preconditions.

But it will also require building democratic institutions, particularly free trade unions. While social democrats may recognize the necessity for a free market, the recognition that a free economy requires a strong free trade union movement does not hold sway among too many businessmen of Western Europe and the United States, many of whom have sought "trade union free zones." Just as communism destroyed the very basis for free trade unionism, democracy should reestablish their legitimacy.

The great democratic revolution begun by the Solidarity trade union movement will succeed with the establishment of strong independent institutions of working people, just as it will succeed with the establishment of strong institutions of a free economy. The AFL-CIO has played an important role in supporting free trade unionism in Poland and elsewhere in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. It will continue to do so and Social Democrats, USA urges full support for its endeavors.

Democracy requires other free institutions: independent media, the rule of law, democratic education--all the plural institutions that make up a democratic society. All this must be accomplished amidst the continuing hold in many countries by the communist *nomenklatura* over the state bureaucracy, economic enterprises, and various social institutions.

The task is a daunting one, and requires significant economic, social and political assistance. To date, the Western democracies have responded weakly and ineffectively to the great challenge of transforming Europe from an armed camp into a democratic one. Economic aid has been misguided (for example food

assistance to Poland, which hurt small farmers) or bottled up in bureaucratic machinery or political dispute.

The task is made more difficult by the lack of a strong democratic tradition. The longest period of democracy was in Czechoslovakia between the wars, and even there social and national conflicts threatened its stability with the rise of Hitler in Germany. Anti-semitism, national prejudices, ethnic conflicts and border disputes were the norm in Eastern Europe. The aspirations for democracy among Eastern Europeans offer the hope that they will overcome these national legacies and the legacy of communism. As the Red Army recedes from Eastern Europe, it is the task of the European democracies and the United States to replace it with an army of democratic practitioners.

Latin America

In the past dozen years, the countries of the Western Hemisphere have made tremendous strides towards democratic rule. Today, only Cuba and Haiti stand out as stark exceptions. SD, USA reaffirms its solidarity with those democratic organizations and parties that have advanced the participation of Latin American peoples in the democratic process. And we continue our support as well to those who are still struggling to end tyranny in their own countries.

The fragile democracies, however, continue to face serious obstacles. The staggering foreign debt burden; social and economic inequality; capital flight; socio-economic systems still dominated by traditional elites; the danger of militaries with undue influence on the political system; continuing human rights violations and internal conflicts, and the voracious narco-trafficking network all threaten to undermine the democratic trend.

The Latin American governments and peoples will have to initiate the programs and policies necessary to eliminate these dangers and to consolidate the democratic process and institutions. However, they cannot be expected to solve these complex problems on their own. A multilateral approach, including the United States, Western Europe, and Canada in conjunction with the more stable democracies in Latin America, can serve to assist them.

A first step in a multilateral effort to address the global drug problem was taken at the Cartagena Summit, attended by President Bush and the Presidents of the An-

dean nations, Virgilio Barco of Colombia, Alan Garcia of Peru, and Jaime Paz Zamora of Bolivia. We applaud the understanding based on mutual responsibility placed on both the supply and demand side of the problem. But without significant, long-term follow through, including cooperative efforts to cope with the overall economic crisis faced by the Andean nations which leaves them vulnerable to the penetration of the drug industry, the problem will not be solved.

A significant factor in this economic crisis is the international debt burden. Social Democrats, USA advocates the creation of a new international mechanism for the purchase of debt at a discount on the secondary market, and the implementation of necessary structural reform, both economic and political, in the debtor nations. However, the cost of the debt crisis must not be placed on the backs of the Latin American people. Care must be taken to maintain basic levels of nutrition, public health and education; and fundamental human and labor rights enshrined in the Charter of the OAS and the Conventions of the ILO must not be infringed.

Despite the dramatic changes taking place in most of the Soviet bloc, Cuba remains an island of totalitarian rule. There is no indication that the command economy, that has led to the economic devastation of the country, is to be changed. Political repression has increased since the United Nations mission in the fall of 1988 and has stepped up even further since the show trials spectacle in July 1989. Approximately two-thirds of all individuals interviewed by the UN delegation are currently incarcerated, including nearly all the representatives of the small but courageous network of independent human rights organizations.

Social Democrats, USA reaffirms its solidarity with those trying to bring democracy to Cuba and to expose Cuba's human rights record to the world. We therefore support the proposal to hold a plebiscite on Castro's continued rule. And we urge those Latin American governments that are considering Cuba's readmission to the OAS to hold Cuba to the standards of representative democracy and full respect for human rights as stated in the OAS Charter.

The aspirations of the Haitian people for political, economic and social justice, expressed when they toppled Jean Claude Duvalier, remain thwarted. The stated commitment of General Prosper Avril to hold free and fair elections was exposed as fraudulent with the violent January crackdown. As a result, parties with which we

have had dealings through the Socialist International demanded that Avril resign before they would participate in the elections scheduled for later this year. Although Avril has now stepped down and left the country, the situation remains precarious and uncertain. In these difficult circumstances, we encourage the United States to increase pressure for a genuine transition to democratic, civilian rule as well as to support pluralist institutions, such as independent trade unions, human rights groups, independent media and political parties and the churches, upon which democracy can be built and sustained.

SD, USA continues its backing for the Central American peace process and reiterates its call for full compliance with the Peace Accords throughout the region. Support for this process from around the world has resulted in promoting the first free and fair elections ever held in Nicaragua. There needs to be continued support for the full implementation of the Accords to complete the democratic transition in Nicaragua, to enhance the prospects for a negotiated solution in El Salvador, and to strengthen respect for human rights throughout the region.

The February 25th elections allowed the Nicaraguan people to express their dissatisfaction with Sandinista rule and their desire for peace, democracy, and improved economic conditions. We commend the role of the international organizations which guaranteed a secret ballot, allowing the Nicaraguan people to vote their conscience. We hope that these organizations that monitored the election and have supported the regional peace process will help ensure that a complete and peaceful transition to civilian rule can be achieved.

The democratically elected government, headed by Violeta Chamorro, faces political, economic and military challenges. The most immediate is resolving the military situation framed by both the existence of the armed resistance and the Sandinista-controlled army and Ministry of Interior. We call for the simultaneous demobilization of the armed resistance and the placing of the FSLN army under civilian control. In particular, the officer corps of the military and the Ministry of Interior must pledge its allegiance to the nation, not to one political party. The country will need substantial amounts of economic assistance to reverse the economic inefficiency of the past decade. This assistance should come not only from the United States, but from other democracies, and should go not only to the government, but directly to private, independent institutions, most especially the independent trade union movement. We

urge the new government not to forget the key role that the trade unions played in the registration and electoral periods which ensured its success at the polls.

SD, USA applauds the primary part in the peace process and the Nicaraguan elections performed by our fraternal party, the National Liberation Party of Costa Rica, and its leader, Oscar Arias. We also note the important contribution of other fraternal parties in the region, especially the Acción Democrática Party of Venezuela.

It is important that we recognize the threat to national sovereignty and self-determination when they are used as the last refuge of a dictator.

Unfortunately, a peaceful resolution to the internal conflicts in El Salvador and Guatemala has yet to be achieved. The incidents of internal and cross-border rightwing terrorism have increased dramatically in both countries. The assassination of Salvadoran MNR leader Hector Oqueli while in Guatemala is the most graphic example. We condemn all such acts of terrorism. The Guatemalan military has increased its veto power over the civilian government. In El Salvador, it is incumbent upon the Administration of President Alfredo Christiani to bring to justice those who are responsible for the death of the priests, labor leaders and others murdered by rightwing terrorists. As well, it must ensure a political space for those on the democratic left. SD, USA also condemns the November 1989 military offensive of the FMLN. In the completely unrealistic notion that the people would join them in a national insurrection, the FMLN contributed not only to the death of innocent civilians but also to the further polarization of the society and gave the extreme right an opportunity to step up its campaign of terror. A recent proposal, accepted by both the FMLN and the government, to seek UN mediation in an effort towards a negotiated solution as called for in the Peace Accords, is a potentially promising sign.

Honduras recently held its third free and fair election in the last decade. There has, however, been an ominous rise in human rights violations by right wing forces often linked to the military, which continues to exert inordinate

influence over civilian governments.

In May 1989, the people of Panama went to the polls and, according to all international observer accounts, defeated General Manuel Noriega's candidates by approximately a three to one margin. They elected Guillermo Endara president of the country. Noriega, after realizing that his attempts to steal the election before the event failed, annulled the process. All subsequent attempts by Panamanian civilians, sectors of the military and the OAS to dislodge him failed. By December 1989, Noriega not only had himself declared head of state, he dramatically increased repression against the Panamanian people and provocations against U.S. military and civilian personnel. After the failure of the extended multilateral effort to resolve the situation, the U.S. finally resorted to armed force to overthrow his government and to bring him back to the United States to face drug trafficking charges.

While many have charged that this action was an infringement upon Panama's right to self-determination, SD, USA recognizes that the only true measure of national sovereignty is the free expression of the political will of the people expressed through the democratic process. Self-appointed leaders who maintain power through force cannot justifiably claim to speak in the name of their people. It is important that we recognize the threat to the principles of national sovereignty and self-determination when they are used as the last refuge of a dictator. In this case, the Panamanian people overwhelmingly welcomed the overthrow of Manuel Noreiga and inauguration of their elected president. The U.S. has incurred a responsibility to ensure that the democratic process is strengthened, to assist in the economic reconstruction, and to comply with the Carter-Torrijos treaties.

SD, USA rejoices in the peaceful transition to democracy currently underway in Chile. We actively assisted the democratic forces in their effort to dislodge the Pinochet dictatorship through a plebiscite. We congratulate the Radical Party, our sister party in the Socialist International, for the constructive role it played in this delicate process. General Pinochet still holds unwarranted power under his 1980 constitution. We will continue to help our democratic friends in their effort to complete the democratic transition through constitutional reform.

We are pleased that after over three decades of repressive rule by General Alfredo Stroessner, Paraguay has

started on the road to democracy. However, there are numerable obstacles in the way of furthering this process. The current constitution and electoral law are still undemocratic in nature. While the new government has allowed a significant degree of political pluralism, the system remains dominated by the long-ruling Colorado Party. The trade unions remain subject to legal restrictions and intimidation. SD, USA will continue to support our fellow SI party, the Febreristas, and other democratic forces in their efforts to press the government of President Andres Rodriguez to fulfill its stated commitment to a full transition to democracy through constitutional and legal reform.

Guyana continues to be dominated by the government of President Desmond Hoyte and the People's National Congress party, elected through blatant fraud in 1985. With new elections due by the end of 1990, we support all democratic forces, including our fraternal party, the Working People's Alliance, in their efforts to press for a greatly needed overhaul of the electoral system. In Suriname, the civilian government remains caught between a still powerful military and ethnic insurgencies. Its efforts to seek a negotiated solution to the conflict are being undermined by the military. We urge the international community to support the civilian government's efforts toward a negotiated settlement. At the same time, we urge the international community to use what influence it can on the military so that it stops its violations of human rights.

The Middle East

The Middle East remains a region of great complexity and instability. The Iran-Iraq war is over, but that confrontation reintroduced the horrifying specter of chemical and other forms of unconventional warfare. Despite reduced aid from the Soviet Union, Syria has refused to give up its goal of achieving military parity with Israel. Only Egypt has signed a peace treaty with the State of Israel, and only recently has Egypt's political isolation in the Arab world come to an end. The democratization that is sweeping the rest of the world has failed to reach the authoritarian regimes that predominate in the Middle East.

The *intifada* (uprising) in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, occupied by the State of Israel since its victory over Arab neighbors bent on its destruction during the Six Day War, has raged for over two years and has aggravated the social, political and economic crisis within Israel. Sadly,

the real needs of Palestinian Arabs have not been met by their self-proclaimed leadership. It is clear that a solution lies only in a negotiated settlement between Israel and a democratically elected Palestinian leadership. To put an end to their very real frustration, the Palestinians must create a responsible, credible partner that has the courage to negotiate with Israel, rather than resort to violence.

The Palestine Liberation Organization has historically been a major impediment to peace, and one can only hope the recent forswearing of terrorism by its chairman will enable the Palestinians to negotiate a settlement with Israel. In this regard, however, we note that the PLO Covenant still calls for the destruction of the State of Israel. While progress for peace remains stalled, extremists have become more active. The Khomeni extremist fundamentalist Hamas, which openly calls for the destruction of Israel, grows in strength in the West Bank, Gaza and Jordan.

We also hope that the changes taking place in the Soviet Union will lead that country to soften its hard line and play a more constructive role in the Middle East than it has to date.

Israel, too, must face up to the challenge of peace. The coalition government of Labor and Likud recently dissolved over the Likud Party's refusal to take the final step in the modest American-endorsed peace process. Social Democrats, USA joins the Israeli Labor and Mapam parties in reconfirming its support for the positions that the State of Israel must exchange "territory for peace," provided that this does not in any way undermine Israel's security needs, and must keep new settlements out of the West Bank and Gaza. At this moment, it is clear that of the major contenders for power, only the Labor Party is willing to take the bold steps necessary for peace with security that Israel so desperately needs.

SD, USA continues to identify strongly with the State of Israel, its social democratic parties and its free trade union movement. Under the leadership of the Labor Zionist movement, Israel has built a model labor society and maintained a vibrant democracy in the face of implacably hostile neighbors and the need to absorb masses of new immigrants. The Israeli social democratic movement created one of the most extensive trade union movements in the world, the Histadrut, representing some 90 percent of the Israeli working population. It developed a network of cooperative settlements, a national health care system, worker-owned enterprises, and the political leadership to guide Israel during its first three

crucial decades of existence. It is with pride that we send fraternal greetings to the Histadrut, and to our sister organizations in the Socialist International, the Labor Party and Mapam.

Africa

Africa has not been immune to the tide of democratic reform that is sweeping across the world, but change on the continent is still far less advanced than elsewhere and faces formidable challenges. These challenges could prove to be insurmountable if the new experiments with democracy now being attempted do not receive the economic and political support they deserve from the international community. Foreign assistance alone cannot solve Africa's awesome problems. More socially just and democratic governments stand a better chance of enabling Africans to help themselves.

Many countries -- Tunisia, Algeria, Mozambique, Benin, Guinea, and Tanzania, among the most notable -- have abandoned authoritarian "socialist" policies and have announced a readiness to adopt multi-party democratic systems. Other countries make no pretensions of reform, and continue to oppress and exploit their citizens. Meanwhile, Africans remain the most impoverished people in the world. While political and economic development must be the primary long-term goal, more pressing disasters face the continent, including war in Sudan, Ethiopia, and Angola and the threat of starvation for millions. Many countries still face runaway population growth rates. In a tragic twist of fate, however, many health officials are now predicting that Africa's population could actually begin to decline within a decade due to the AIDS scourge; some have warned that as much as a third of the population could be wiped out in its prime.

These social and economic problems will seriously complicate any efforts towards democratic reform. Yet the United States is providing only a little more than \$500 million in aid to sub-Saharan Africa, about the cost of a single B-1 Bomber. Social Democrats thus support increased aid levels, especially where these can be tied to efforts at political reform.

Three countries deserve special mention: Nigeria, South Africa and Angola. Nigeria, a long-time American ally, has embarked on a two-year transition from military dictatorship to democracy. The government has created two political parties, the "Social

Democratic Party" and the "National Republican Party" to compete in a process modeled after the American system. The transition is threatened by a structural adjustment program that is contributing to massive economic dislocation. Corruption, ethnic rivalry, and apathy could also doom the process. Yet Nigeria has strong traditions of freedom and political participation that give democracy a fighting chance. If successful, Nigeria would be the third largest democracy in the world after India and the U.S. and would exert an irresistible influence on the rest of Africa and the third world to follow its lead. Incredibly, almost no Western assistance has been directed to Nigeria. Nigeria should become a new *cause celebre* for social democrats around the world.

South Africa has once again captured the world's attention with the breathtaking developments of the last few months, including the unbanning of the A.N.C., the release of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners, and the inexorable progress being made towards peaceful negotiations leading to the possibility of a socially just and democratic system. But the transformation to a new order has only begun. The pillars of apartheid -- the Internal Security, Group Areas, Population Registration, and Separate Amenities acts -- still remain. Most importantly, black South Africans still do not have a true franchise. All South Africans must participate in the political process if any deal struck between the A.N.C. and the Nationalist government is ultimately to succeed. Otherwise economic issues, especially the redistribution of the land, will prove to be critical as South Africa attempts to restructure. Social Democrats, USA will continue its support to community organizations that are attempting to build democratic infrastructures in South Africa. Above all, every effort will be made to support and expand relations with the South African trade union movement, which is the single largest and most powerful democratic institution in South Africa today.

We have high hopes for a peaceful settlement to the civil war in Angola. In the meantime, we urge that the United States maintain its support for UNITA.

Asia

Although communism appears to be dying in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, the outlook is not so sanguine in Asia, where Stalinism, Maoism, Kim Il-sungism, Ho Chi Minhism and other commun"isms", albeit ailing, remain very much alive.

Asia is also the region where market-oriented policies which former Soviet satellites seek to emulate have enjoyed stunning success. The economic growth rates of Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, Hong Kong, and Thailand have excited admiration and envy. The glowing reports fail to note, however, that in Asia, these policies discourage domestic consumption, encourage predatory and mercantilistic trade practices, and repress basic workers' rights. Economic growth in Asia has given birth to the new development theory of "authoritarian capitalism", which holds that the best political framework for economic success is some sort of tightly-disciplined, authoritarian or semi-authoritarian structure in which private capital is invested to further national economic goals. In this view, democratic pluralism is the enemy of economic success, and is best postponed or avoided.

Many American corporations in the region, no less than their Asian counterparts, are enamored of this philosophy. From Burma to Thailand, down the Malay Peninsula and across the Strait of Malacca to Indonesia, democratic freedoms, particularly freedom of association, remain threatened and repressed. Accordingly, in non-communist Asia, the greatest immediate threat to democratic practices does not come from Marxist-inspired insurgencies (the Philippines excepted) but from the policies of authoritarian governments.

Social Democrats, USA urges the Bush Administration to remind its allies and trading partners in Asia that there can be no long term economic success without democracy. There are some tools available, particularly regarding freedom of association. Section 301 of the Omnibus Tariff and Trade Act contains new worker rights language. There has been worker rights language in the Generalized System of Preferences legislation since 1984. Good faith enforcement of this legislation by the U.S. government would demonstrate to Asian rulers that America is serious about promoting democratic principles everywhere in the region.

While often improving the economic standard of living of many of the people in the area, the current emphasis on markets and export-driven growth will not necessarily also lead to the increased democratization that we insist on seeing in these countries. This emphasis is not limited to the capitalist countries of Asia. Indeed, curious relationships have developed between some of Asia's capitalists and communists. Dictatorships in China, Laos, Vietnam, and Cambodia are desperately seeking to spur failing economies, even with policies that strike at

the heart of Marxist-Leninist principles. And business is lured by the cheapest labor available in a cheap labor region of the world.

The People's Republic of China was the first communist country in Asia to embrace economic pragmatism, establishing Special Economic Zones in Guangdong Province. In the 10 years since China's economic reforms began, the income of almost every town along the Pearl River delta increased more than 400 percent. These towns bulge with immigrants from throughout China, and, unsurprisingly, boom times have brought old vices such as prostitution, child labor and unemployment.

The reforms that spurred Guangdong's economic growth spread haphazardly throughout the rest of China. They played a major role in the resurgence of the democracy movement, crushed so brutally at Tiananmen Square. While striving mightily to destroy the democracy movement, China's leaders say that they will not step back from their collaboration with capitalism. And it appears quite clear that renewed repression in China will not deter businessmen from engaging in new ventures once they perceive that stability has been re-established.

There can be no long term economic success without democracy.

Some form of stability is just around the corner. The crackdown begun after the Tiananmen Square massacre apparently has worsened. Surveillance of students has been increased, a massive political re-education drive has been launched, there are more restrictions on overseas study and increased persecution of religious groups, particularly the Roman Catholic Church. Chinese rulers have also purged or punished journalists and police officials who expressed support for the students. Thousands of peaceful dissenters remain imprisoned without trial. Many other students are being assigned to work in the provinces, where, according to Li Peng, by working with peasants and workers they can "acquire a correct outlook of the world." Martial law remains in force in Tibet. Furthermore, there is increased evidence that the Chinese

are using forced labor -- inmates of prisons and labor camps -- to produce the textiles they need to keep their booming export trade to the U.S. and other countries in gear.

In this dismal situation, President Bush has nothing to offer but a shameful, wretched policy of rapprochement. While democracy leaders in Eastern Europe and dissidents in China seek inspiration from Jefferson and Lincoln, Bush looks to Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger for policy guidance. His senior China specialist on the National Security Council recently was quoted in the *New York Times*, with regard to the thousands of peaceful demonstrators who are in jail: "The very fact that so many detainees have not been tried indicates some degree of restraint" on the part of the Chinese government.

Clearly, U.S. policy, not to mention its policy makers, must change. Federal law forbids the importation of goods produced by forced labor. Congress must end the tacit U.S. support for slave labor economics and immediately deny China most-favored-nation status and eligibility for participation in the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) program. President Bush must use what shreds of moral authority he retains on this issue to urge U.S. allies to end or severely curtail commercial contacts.

The U.S. must launch a vigorous campaign of support for Chinese dissidents wherever they are. The National Endowment for Democracy is well-positioned to undertake increased efforts in this regard if it has the funding. The Congress must take affirmative steps to protect Chinese students living in this country from intimidation and abuse by Chinese diplomats and to offer them sanctuary. These students must not be placed in the position of relying on the good will and judgment of the Bush Administration.

Events in China shook Hong Kong, which faces annexation by the PRC in 1997. The immediate impact was to strengthen foreign support for a coalition of labor, church and other Hong Kong groups that is fighting a losing battle to guarantee basic human rights once the mainland achieves sovereignty. The U.S. must urge the Thatcher government to take the lead in formulating a coordinated free world policy to receive what is likely to be a mass exodus from the crown colony as 1997 draws near. We take note of the progress toward democracy made in Taiwan and South Korea and express the hope that the democratizing process will be carried forward in the future.

In the Philippines, stable democracy appears as far away as ever. Although President Corazon Aquino has survived numerous coup attempts, her failure to address the fundamental, structural economic and social problems that plague her country does not auger well for the future. The arrest of former Defense Minister Juan Ponce Enrile for complicity in recent coups looks more like a power struggle between traditional Filipino oligarchs than evidence of a coherent strategy for change. Even the good news is laced with caveats. Experts believe that the Communist New People's Army has lost ground over the past two years. Its decline is due to a more effective counterinsurgency strategy by the army, a somewhat improved economy, President Aquino's stubborn popularity, and the deadly work of the anti-communist vigilantes. This success has come at the cost of increased foreign and domestic criticism of the Aquino government's failure to control human rights abuses by the army and the vigilantes.

President Aquino has promised to crack down on human rights abusers. These efforts, along with an agreement with the International Monetary Fund, are keys to a plan by the U.S., Japan and other countries to put together a badly-needed Multilateral Assistance Initiative (MAI) for the Philippines. But Filipino leaders appear torn between resentment of foreign intervention, and their desperate need for it.

In the meantime, relations between the Philippines and the U.S. have worsened. The American military presence saved Filipino democracy and President Aquino during the army's last major coup, but an inflamed public opinion, led by Manila's intellectual community, feels more resentment than gratitude. Base negotiations remain contentious.

The time has come to re-examine U.S. policy in the Philippines. It may be that our bases serve only to inflame nationalist resentment and shift attention away from the oligarchic social and economic structure that is at the heart of the country's problems. Perhaps the U.S., with its military assets redeployed to Guam, could then play a constructive role in the change that the Filipino people need and deserve.

There is a growing body of public opinion in the United States that argues for normalization of relations with Vietnam. There are arguments in favor of an easing of tensions, most of them economic. U.S. firms, it is said, will fall behind if commercial sanctions are not lifted and lose another important market to the Japanese,

among others. This is a genuine concern, and not just in Vietnam. The political arguments for a reconciliation are less clear, but some say that the isolation only exacerbates tensions on the Indochinese peninsula.

But there are also good reasons to resist the urge to embrace these communists. Continuing concerns over Americans missing in action and verification of Vietnamese withdrawal from Cambodia rank high on the list. And despite putative "reforms" by the Vietnamese government, the country is still a dictatorship. Amnesty International says that political prisoners continue to be detained without trial, and that there are persistent reports of torture and ill-treatment and the use of the death penalty for prisoners of conscience. At least 130 former officials of the old Saigon regime remain in custody, nearly 15 years after the communist victory. Other prisoners of conscience held without trial include priests, nuns, and monks, writers and artists and people held because they are ethnic Chinese or attempted an "illegal departure."

Clearly, normalization must not proceed until these issues are addressed. It would be hypocrisy tinged with racism for the U.S. to sell short in Asia those values it struggled so long and so successfully to uphold in Europe.

We welcome the United Nations' offer to give the Cambodian people the chance to choose their own form of government. We call upon the American people and their elected representatives to fully support the United Nations Security Council peace plan for an interim UN government of Cambodia, which will organize and guarantee free elections for the Cambodian people. This means that there must be a powerful UN political and military presence --before, during and after these elections -- so that no faction can sabotage the democratic rights of the Cambodian people.

We call upon the American people, and their representatives in the Executive and Congressional branches, to give their full support to the noncommunist resistance pending full acceptance of the UN peace plan by the two communist factions. Only the noncommunist resistance movements respect the traditional values of the Cambodian people. Only the noncommunist resistance groups respect the freedom which is enjoyed by the people of the United States. The Soviet Union and Vietnam on one side, and China on the other, continue to arm the rival Cambodian communist factions. The United States should help the more popular noncom-

unist Cambodian movements, which are natural friends of democratic America.

In a manner reminiscent of the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia, the Burmese dictatorship has forcibly moved more than half a million Burmese citizens from the Myanmar cities to the countryside. We condemn this action and call for vigilance lest the horrors of Cambodia be repeated.

Japan is the world's new economic power and has naturally turned that power into political leverage. A major form of that leverage is foreign assistance. In 1988, Japan overtook the U.S. to become the world's biggest donor of aid to developing countries. Most of that aid goes to Asia and is used to promote business advantages for Japan's trading companies. Japan has shown no interest, to date, in using its new strength to promote democratic values although it most certainly owes its current economic eminence to the freedom the American defense umbrella afforded. Even Richard Nixon has swiftly dismissed the notion that Japan will use its economic clout to promote democratic change.

This attitude must change. The Bush Administration should increase the pressure on Japan, not only to open its markets to other countries, but to play the constructive political role in favor of democracy that its economic strength demands.

Defense Policy

The changes that characterized the political development of the world in the 1980s, and especially in 1989, will necessarily affect American national security policy. It is not yet clear how this affect will take shape; however, it is impossible not to notice certain trends that indicate that a serious reconsideration of the defense policies of this country is warranted.

So great and fundamental were these changes that they, coupled with recent military technological breakthroughs, are forcing the country to re-examine its defense structure, the nature of the threat facing the United States, and the question of how best to organize that structure to face that threat.

The most dramatic change wrought by the "Revolution of 1989" on defense issues is the almost total collapse of the Warsaw Pact, which has been dealt a blow of crippling, if not fatal, force. The Warsaw Pact is no longer

a credible threat to NATO. We note with relief that a conventional attack on NATO has been ruled out by even the most hard-line policy makers in and out of government.

But it would be premature to conclude from the withering of the Warsaw Pact that the Soviet Union no longer poses a threat to the United States. The collapse of the Warsaw Pact denies the USSR forward positions in Eastern Europe and strips it of its European military allies. However a still formidable Soviet military machine remains in place. There is still an impressive Soviet military presence in Europe, for that matter, between its western borders and the Ural mountains. Reliable estimates place Soviet military spending at as much as one-fifth of the GNP. Military needs constitute about one-half of the Soviet government budget.

For this reason, the United States should maintain a military presence in Europe and continue to act as the backbone of NATO. A full-scale American military withdrawal from Europe would be desirable sometime in the future, but for now it is unwise. Circumstances warrant reductions, but not enough to alter the foundations of American power on the continent. In case of an emergency, it would take weeks if not months for the United States to redeploy any forces it removes from Europe. In contrast, the Soviets could redeploy more quickly. The ease with which Soviet armored divisions are departing Czechoslovakia belies the ease with which they could return.

World-wide, Soviet military power continues to manifest itself in two important and unambiguous ways. First, the USSR possesses an awesome arsenal of strategic weapons. Far from the cuts one might expect the USSR to have on the strategic drawing board, the USSR actually is busy constructing a more powerful and effective nuclear force. Its program of modernization includes the introduction of new ICBMs (the SS-24 and SS-25) and the upgrading of the heaviest ICBM in the Soviet arsenal, the SS-8. The sea-borne and air-borne components of the Soviet nuclear triad are also expanding with the continuing production of two new missile subs and two new bombers.

Second, Soviet military activity in other parts of the world goes on in ways that contradict the peaceful signals coming from Europe. For example, new Soviet naval bases are under construction in the Mediterranean, and the existing base at Cam Ranh Bay in Vietnam is being

expanded. And it is not at all clear that Red Army troops being removed Eastern Europe will be deactivated rather than redeployed to another theater, perhaps to face American friends and allies in Asia and the Pacific.

It could be that these trends in Soviet military behavior will change, and we will welcome such a change when it comes. But the fact is there is a difference between Soviet rhetoric and Soviet behavior in this area, and it would behoove the United States to remain cautious.

Moreover the 1980s brought new roles for the American military. It will be necessary for the United States to maintain forces sufficient to meet the threats that necessitated this development. Among these are drug trafficking and regional conflicts requiring either U.S. intervention or a strong American military presence to keep the peace. Recent events in South and Central America and the Middle East best illustrate this.

The fact is the military threat facing the United States, much like the political situation in the world, is in tremendous flux. It is not clear how the situation will sort itself out, though it is clear that there will be no quick resolution to it. We hope that circumstances will further diminish the threat facing the United States and its democratic allies so that the portions of their wealth dedicated to satisfying military needs may be redistributed. But, it is too early to judge the circumstances with the certainty that would be required to justify a decision to make deep cuts in U.S. forces at this time.

The United States must be prepared to continue its role

as the world's foremost defender of democracy. It must be able to meet any and all contingencies presented to it. This will not be an easy task with the world situation as volatile as it is. It will require acute sensitivity to the changing situation in the world and a keen concept of the nature of the threat.

We recognize the burden defense spending puts on our society, and we are concerned that it not command a disproportionate share of American wealth. For too long, American workers have borne too large a share of the cost of this defense, be it measured in tax contributions, lost social spending, or in blood. A defense adequate to the new environment benefits all sectors of our society and the cost must be shared appropriately by all. In no instance will we tolerate attempts to place the burden on the backs of the working men and women of this country.

Reductions in defense spending must be generated by the reduced threat, not by a budget deficit or unmet social needs. Similarly, these social needs must be met without having to wait for any peace dividend, which may prove ephemeral. It is the responsibility of the American government to provide for both the general welfare and the common defense. If maintaining an adequate defense and adequate social welfare is beyond the current financial ability of the government, we believe the money must be raised in some fashion to provide for them. It is the duty of a government to make these available to its people and it is the function of government to make them possible. □

Social Democrats, USA is the movement of Eugene V. Debs, Norman Thomas, A. Philip Randolph, Bayard Rustin and countless others who have worked and continue to work tirelessly to extend the benefits of freedom and economic justice to all Americans and to people the world over.

Please send me further information about Social Democrats, USA.

I enclose a contribution of \$ _____ to further the educational work of Social Democrats, USA.

I would like to join Social Democrats, USA and have enclosed \$25.00 for first-year dues (\$13 for students, unemployed, and retired).

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

And send to: Social Democrats, USA, 815 15th Street, NW, Suite 511, Washington, D.C. 20005

FP '90